

**REMARKS**

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action mailed on October 20, 2005. Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 15-16, 23, and 25-33 are currently pending in this application, with claims 6, 15, 16, 23, 25 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 being independent. *No new matter has been added.*

**Drawing Objections**

Page 2 of the Office Action includes an objection to the drawings.

In particular, the Office Action contends that the damper housing being fixed to a hole edge of the through hole on one surface side of the resin plate and a cover plate fixed to a hole edge on another side as recited in claims 29-31 and the through hole of claims 32 must be shown in the drawings or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).

This objection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

The paraphrase made on page two of the Office Action for the features found within claims 29-32 appears to be an altered recitation of those claims. Nevertheless, the language complained of within the Office Action is believed found at least within Figures 4A, 4B, and 4C of the specification as originally filed.

Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**Allowable subject matter**

Page 5 of the Office Action indicates that claims 16, 23 and 27-28 are allowed and that claims 6, 14-15 and 29-34 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Appreciation is expressed for the indication that the claims contain allowable subject matter.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Page 3 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claims 6, 14-15 and 29-34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

While not conceding the propriety of these rejections and in order to advance the prosecution of the above-identified application, the claims have been amended.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Page 4 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claims 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Japanese Application Publication No. 07-037375 to Takahashi (JP 7-37375) in view of Japanese Application Publication No. 11-010660 to Nishiyama (JP 11-10660).

This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

Claim 26 is dependent upon claim 25. Claim 25 is drawn to a mechanical chassis apparatus including a non-contact reading mechanism for a disc recording medium and a vibration preventing damper attached on a chassis member supported in a floating condition through the vibration preventing damper within a casing, comprising:

the vibration preventing damper having a damper housing made of a resin material, provided with a holder portion in a form of a container opened at one end for inserting a support shaft provided in the casing, and an elastic wall portion for reducing floating movement of the support shaft due to elastic deformation in three-dimensional directions,

the chassis member having a plate-like resin portion,

wherein an inner portion space of the damper housing is closed by the plate-like resin portion of the chassis member that functions as a cover plate by fixing the opening side end portion of the damper housing to the plate-like resin portion of the chassis member, so that the vibration preventing member is formed integrally with the chassis member without using mechanical fasteners.

**Takahashi** - Takahashi arguably teaches a vibration-proof supporting device that includes a first member 20 and a second member 21 (Takahashi at Figure 8). However, the Office Action admits that Takahashi fails to disclose teach or suggest the disclosure of forming the lid/forming portion from resin (Office Action at page 4).

As a result, Takahashi fails to disclose, teach or suggest the chassis member having a plate-like resin portion, as claimed.

**Nishiyama** - Nishiyama arguably teaches a vibration-roof damper 10 and a chassis 22 (Nishiyama at Figure 2).

However, the Office Action fails to show that chassis 22 of Nishiyama has a plate-like resin portion.

As a result, Nishiyama fails to disclose, teach or suggest the chassis member having a plate-like resin portion, as claimed.

Takahashi and Nishiyama, either individually or as a whole, fail to disclose, teach or suggest all claimed features.

Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753.

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

Dated: January 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By  

David T. Nikaido

Registration No.: 22,663

Brian K. Dutton

Registration No.: 47,255

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorneys for Applicant